

Application Serial No: 10/594,700

Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: August 13, 2008

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 13, 2008. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-11 and 18-25 are amended. Claim 1 is amended to include features of claims 2, 3 and 5-7. Claim 1 is further amended to make minor editorial revisions. Claims 4, 5, 8 and 9 are amended to track the amendments to claim 1. Claim 10 is amended into independent form and includes features of original claims 1-3 and 5-7. Claim 10 is further amended to make minor editorial revisions. Claim 11 is amended into independent form and includes features of original claims 1-3 and 5-7. Claim 11 is further amended to make minor editorial revisions. Claims 18-25 are amended to track the amendments to claim 11. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 15-17 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 26 and 27 are new. Claim 26 is new and is supported, for example, in the specification on page 34, line 19-page 36, line 11 and in Figures 16 and 17. Claim 26 also includes features of original claims 1 and 2. Claim 27 is new and is supported, for example, in the specification on page 39, lines 17-26 and in Figure 24. Claim 27 also includes features of original claims 1 and 2. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-14 and 18-27 are pending.

Amended Claims 1, 10 and 11:

Claim 1 is amended to include the features of allowable claim 7 except the features of original claim 5 relating to the "projecting direction", as these features are not related to the allowable features in claim 7. Claim 1 is further amended to make minor editorial revisions. Accordingly, claim 1 should now be allowable.

Claim 10 is amended into independent form and includes the features of 1-3 and 5-7, except the features of original claim 5 relating to the "projecting direction", as these features are not related to the allowable features in claim 10. Claim 10 is further amended to make minor editorial revisions. Accordingly, claim 10 should now be allowable.

Claim 11 is amended into independent form and includes the features of 1-3 and 5-7, except the features of original claim 5 relating to the "projecting direction", as these features are not related to the allowable features in claim 11. Claim 11 is further

Application Serial No: 10/594,700
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: August 13, 2008

amended to make minor editorial revisions. Accordingly, claim 11 should now be allowable.

§102 Rejections:

Claims 1-4 are rejected as being anticipated by Takamatsu (JP No. 2001-57319). Claims 1-4 are rejected as being anticipated by Kanetake (JP No. 2003-142347). These rejections are traversed.

As discussed above, claim 1 is amended to include the features of allowable claim 7. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is requested as claim 1 is allowable over the Takamatsu and Kanetake references. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicant does not concede the correctness of these rejections.

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected as being anticipated by Love (US Patent No. 4,599,788). This rejection is now moot as claims 15 and 16 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection.

§103 Rejections:

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected as being unpatentable over Takamatsu. This rejection is traversed. Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons discussed above. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Claims 17, 18 and 22 are rejected as being unpatentable over Love in view of Yoshida (US Patent Publication No. 2003/0218859). This rejection is traversed.

As discussed above, claim 11, from which claims 18 and 22 depend, is amended into independent form. As claims 18 and 22 depend from claim 11, these claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons. The rejection of claim 17 is moot in view of its cancellation. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Claims 20, 21 and 23 are rejected as being unpatentable over Love in view of Yoshida and further in view of Yoshida '371 (US Patent No. 6,351,371). This rejection

Application Serial No: 10/594,700
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: August 13, 2008

is traversed. As discussed above, claim 11, from which claims 20, 21 and 23 depend, is amended into independent form. As claims 20, 21 and 23 depend from claim 11, these claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Claim 24 is rejected as being unpatentable over Love in view of Yoshida and further in view of Reichert (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0028922). This rejection is traversed. As discussed above, claim 11, from which claim 24 depends, is amended into independent form. As claim 24 depends from claim 11, this claim should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection.

Claim 25 is rejected as being unpatentable over Love in view of Yoshida and further in view of Edson (US Patent Publication No. 2004/0066607). This rejection is traversed. As discussed above, claim 11, from which claim 25 depends, is amended into independent form. As claim 25 depends from claim 11, this claim should be allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection.

New Claims:

In order to expedite the prosecution of this matter, the following is noted with respect to new claims 26 and 27.

New claim 26 is directed to a solid electrolytic capacitor that requires, among other features, a wire made of a valve metal, the wire being entirely embedded in each of the first and second sintered bodies and bonded directly to each of the first and second metal plates. None of the prior art references cited in the rejections above teach or suggest a wire made of a valve metal, the wire being entirely embedded in each of the first and second sintered bodies and bonded directly to each of the first and second metal plates as required by claim 26. Accordingly, claim 26 should be allowed.

New claim 27 is directed to a solid electrolytic capacitor that requires, among other features, first and second metal plates that each have an inner surface formed with a

Application Serial No: 10/594,700
Responsive to the Office Action mailed on: August 13, 2008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 13 2009

recess and a projection in contact with a respective one of the first and second sintered bodies. None of the prior art references cited in the rejections above teach or suggest first and second metal plates that each have an inner surface formed with a recess and a projection in contact with a respective one of the first and second sintered bodies, as required by claim 27. Accordingly, claim 27 should be allowed.

Conclusion:


Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1, 4, 5, 8-14 and 18-27 are in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's primary attorney-of record, Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300), at (612) 455-3804.



Dated: February 13, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 
Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/ahk